UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,643	12/29/1999	CHERYL CAMP HAYNES	19260-1800/B	2514

23370 7590 11/20/2002

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/474,643	HAYNES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 August 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final office action in response to communications received on 08/12/2002. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's submission of an amended abstract is sufficient to overcome the specification objection set forth in the previous office action.

3. Applicant's amendment to claim 20 is sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MAX (NYNEX Science and Technology Center). This is a product rejection. Therefore, the following references explaining the different aspects of MAX are considered as describing one product:

i. Article "NYNEX cuts operational costs in 40 offices using expert system" from PR Newswire (referred to herein as reference A)

ii. Article by Karpinski, "Rhyme and Reason: Artificial Intelligence in the public network", from Telephony (referred to herein as reference B)

iii. Article "AAAI's twenty-one best expert systems applications" from Intelligent Software Strategies (referred to herein as reference C)

5. As per claim 1, MAX discloses a method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician when a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments indicates a dispatch is required, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss reviewing a service order for a problem to determine whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria (rules) known to the system that indicate that the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch);

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss determining if the service order for a problem meets the predefined criteria (rules) and, if so, determining if the dispatch would be unnecessary based on what is known to the system); and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then canceling a dispatch associated with the service order (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss

canceling the dispatch assigned to a service order if the system determines that the dispatch is unnecessary).

6. As per claim 5, MAX discloses a method wherein determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining whether the service order includes an assignment of facilities (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, which discusses the service order for a problem and the service order including an assignment of facilities to be addressed. The predefined criteria (rules) of the expert system allows the system to determine the assignment and its need for a technician to be dispatched).

7. As per claim 7, MAX discloses a method wherein canceling the dispatch comprises:

correcting the service order so that the dispatch associated with the service order is canceled (See reference A, page 1, sections 1, 3, and 5, and page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discusses the expert system screening and correcting the service order, which alters and cancels the dispatch associated with the service order).

8. As per claim 11, MAX discuses a system for eliminating unnecessary dispatches, comprising:

a service order control system for receiving service requests from a source and for generating a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss a control center receiving service requests from customers, these service requests reflecting needs based on problems and used to generate service orders for the problem, these service orders including facilities tasks that need to be completed);

a work management center for receiving the service order from the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss the knowledge based system at a center determining if the service order for a problem meets the predefined criteria (rules) and, if so, determining if the dispatch would be unnecessary based on what is known to the system); and

a trap service order system for monitoring the service order generated by the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so, determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary by comparing the service order type and information in a selected field of the service order with a set of predefined criteria that indicate the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss screening/monitoring the generated service order and trapping the service order if the dispatch is unnecessary by looking at specific areas known to the system that cause a dispatch to not be needed. For example, see reference A, page 1, sections 3 and 5).

9. As per claim 16, MAX discloses a system wherein the trap service order system is operative to identify all service orders that require a dispatch and that meet a set of predefined criteria (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 2, and page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss the systems ability to trap service orders by identifying all service orders that require a dispatch. The service orders requiring dispatch are determined based on predefined criteria (rules) known to the system. See reference A, page 1, section 1, 3, and 4).

10. As per claim 17, MAX discusses a method for eliminating a dispatch of a service technician specified by a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments which is unnecessary, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch by examining selected sections of the service order (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss determining if service orders for maintenance meet a set of predefined criteria (rules) that indicate that the dispatch will prove to be unnecessary. These rules indicate areas that specify the dispatch is unnecessary. For example, see reference A, page 1, section 3 and 5);

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss the knowledge based system at a center determining if the service order for a problem meets the predefined criteria (rules) and, if so, determining if the dispatch would be unnecessary based on what is known to the system); and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then eliminating the dispatch by correcting the service order and canceling a dispatch order for the dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss screening/monitoring the generated service order and eliminating the service order if the dispatch is unnecessary).

11. As per claim 18, MAX discusses a method wherein the set of predefined criteria is selected based upon an analysis of past dispatches (See reference A, page 1, sections 3 and 5, and reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, which discusses analyzing past dispatches to discover patterns

and draw inferences that form the knowledge base. This knowledge base serves as the predefined criteria (rules) by which the present dispatches are judged).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MAX (NYNEX Science and Technology Center).

14. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-15, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MAX (NYNEX Science and Technology Center) in view of Farris et al. (U.S. 5,644,619).

These are product rejection. Therefore, the following references explaining the different aspects of MAX are considered as describing one product:

i. Article "NYNEX cuts operational costs in 40 offices using expert system" from PR Newswire (referred to herein as reference A)

ii. Article by Karpinski, "Rhyme and Reason: Artificial Intelligence in the public network", from Telephony (referred to herein as reference B)

iii. Article "AAAI's twenty-one best expert systems applications" from Intelligent Software Strategies (referred to herein as reference C)

(NYNEX).

15. As per claim 3, MAX discloses a method that determines whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria and whether the service order requires the dispatch of a service technician (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, and reference C, page 3, section 1, wherein the service order meets a set of predefined criteria (rules) and whether the service order requires a dispatch of a service technician). However, MAX does not expressly disclose that the feature of an override code.

In any technology based system there is always an overseer that administers the system and has the ability to override the results or determinations of the system. For example, a manager at a store has the ability to override the results produced on a cash register or a system administrator can override the outcome of a network event. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow an overseer to have an override code for the MAX system in order to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the service provided by the tool by giving an administrator the ability to override a result in the case of an undesired outcome.

16. As per claim 2, MAX teaches a method that determines whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss reviewing a service order for a problem to determine whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria (rules) known to the system that indicate that

the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch). However, MAX does not expressly disclose determining whether a competitive local exchange carrier initiated the service order.

Farris et al. teaches that a service representative from a company providing telecommunications services interacts with the user to define the service request, this service request being presented to the internal and external system for verification and implementation (See at least column 16, lines 66-67, column 17, lines 1-22, column 19, lines 32-67, and column 20, lines 1-7, 15-20, and 45-51, which discuss a service representative working with a customer to establish a service order request. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 opened up local telephone service to business competition. All phone and telecommunications companies offering local service, such as the companies of Farris et al., are competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC). Therefore, Farris et al. teaches competitive local exchange carriers).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make sure the service order of MAX was initiated by a competitive local exchange carrier in order to increase the number of companies willing to use the tool by maintaining a fair and unbiased image within the competition.

17. As per claim 4, MAX teaches a method that determines whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch and that relates a pending service order to previous service orders (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss reviewing a service order for a problem to determine whether the service order meets a

set of predefined criteria (rules) known to the system that indicate that the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch. Reference A, page 1, section 3, also discloses system knowledge about the service order and previous actions taken in relation to said service). However, MAX does not expressly disclose determining whether the service order is related to a second pending service order.

Farris et al. discloses determining whether the service order is related to a second pending service order (See column 17, lines 9-18 and 55-65, column 18, lines 26-45, column 19, lines 31-50, and column 20, lines 15-30, which discloses maintaining all status information concerning an addresses lines and all service orders concerning that line, both past and pending. This information is accessed upon a new service request).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine if a new service order of MAX is related to another pending service order in order to minimize the amount of unnecessary work that goes into a service order by consolidating the efforts needed for both orders.

18. As per claim 6, MAX teaches a method wherein determining whether the service indicates that a dispatch is unnecessary comprises:

determining whether the service order includes an assignment of facilities (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, which discusses the service order for a problem and the service order including an assignment of facilities to be addressed. The predefined criteria (rules) of the

expert system allows the system to determine the assignment and its need for a technician to be dispatched).

However, MAX does not expressly disclose determining whether this assignment of facilities uses the same facilities that were previously assigned to a location associated with the service order.

Farris et al. discloses determining whether this assignment of facilities uses the same facilities that were previously assigned to a location associated with the service order (See at least column 12, lines 54-60, column 14, lines 7-10 and 56-67, column 15, lines 1-8, column 16, lines 59-61, column 17, lines 5-31 and 48-58, and column 20, lines 15-23, which discuss determining whether the assignment of facilities uses the same facilities that were previously assigned to the location referred to in the service order).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine if the facilities assigned in the service order of MAX were previously assigned to a location associated with the service order in order to increase the overall accuracy of the dispatches of technicians by more precisely assessing the needs of a service order, as stated in reference A, page 1, section 1. More accurate dispatches equates to money saved, as stated in reference A, page 1, section 4.

19. As per claim 8, MAX teaches a method that determines whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C,

page 3, section 1, which discuss reviewing a service order for a problem to determine whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria (rules) known to the system that indicate that the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch). However, MAX does not expressly disclose determining whether the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined time period or if the dispatch is scheduled to occur within the predetermined time period, then placing the dispatch on hold prior to determining whether the dispatch is necessary.

Farris et al. discloses:

determining whether the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined time period (See figure 14, column 20, lines 1-5, and column 29, lines 30-39, wherein the system determines whether the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined time. This time is arranged by the service representative with the customer); and

if the dispatch is scheduled to occur within the predetermined time period, then placing the dispatch on hold prior to determining whether the dispatch is necessary (See figures 14 and 15, and column 20, lines 12-51, wherein the dispatch is arranged with the customer to occur within a predetermined time period. This dispatch is placed on hold until the determining if the dispatch is necessary occurs. If it is determined unnecessary it is cancelled from the customer service request. If it is determined necessary it is implemented and pushed forward).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the dispatch of the technician of MAX on hold until a determination about the dispatch would be made in order to maximize the money saved and the

service provided by using the system by not allowing a technician to be unnecessarily dispatched before a determination can be made. As stated in reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 4, the unnecessary dispatch of a technician has large financial and customer service ramifications.

20. As per claim 9, MAX discloses a method for determining whether a dispatch is unnecessary with the ability to see the reasoning behind the decision for the dispatch to be cancelled (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, which discusses a method that determines if a dispatch of a technician is unnecessary. See reference A, page 1, section 5, and page 2, section 1, which allows users to view the determinations of the MAX expert system). However, MAX does not expressly disclose that this method comprises in response to receiving a query based upon ones of the predefined criteria, searching a database of pending service orders that indicate a dispatch is required to locate service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria or providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria.

Farris et al. teaches:

in response to receiving a query based upon ones of the predefined criteria, searching a database of pending service orders that indicate a dispatch is required to locate service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See at least column 15, lines 9-15 and 28-50, column 18, lines 37-50, column 20, lines 29-32, and column 37, lines 40-44, wherein users are allowed to question the system for data stored in the system database. Data stored about a specific service request includes information indicating a dispatch of a technician is required. These service orders that require dispatches can be searched on predefined criteria); and

providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See at least column 15, lines 9-15 and 28-50, column 18, lines 37-50, column 20, lines 29-32, wherein the system is queried for information which is accessible to the users).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to search the records of the service requests processed by the expert system of MAX in order to both ensure the accuracy of the results provided by the MAX system as well as increase the understanding of new administrators who can learn about diagnosing situations based on the determinations of the system, as stated in reference A, page 2, section 1.

21. As per claim 10, MAX discloses a method for determining whether a dispatch is unnecessary with the ability to see the reasoning behind the decision for the dispatch to be cancelled (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, which discusses a method that determines if a dispatch of a technician is unnecessary. See reference A, page 1, section 5, and page 2, section 1, which allows users to view the determinations of the MAX expert system). However, MAX does not expressly disclose that this method comprises periodically generating a report based upon the selected ones of the predefined criteria that includes all service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria or providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria.

Farris et al. discloses:

periodically generating a report based upon the selected ones of the predefined criteria that includes all service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See at least column 15, lines 9-15 and 28-50, column 18, lines 37-50, column 19, lines 2-9, which discuss occasionally generating a report based on selected predefined criteria, which includes address information, facility information, appointment availability, etc. See also column 17, lines 5-14, 23-34, and 55-64, column 21, lines 1-19, and column 23, lines 7-29, which discuss some of the information and data maintained in the databases that is available to be searched by a user and placed in the report).

providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See column 18, lines 37-50, and column 19, lines 2-9, which discuss providing the service orders).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a report based on predefined criteria and the service requests processed by the expert system of MAX in order to both ensure the accuracy of the results provided by the MAX system as well as increase the understanding of new administrators who can learn about diagnosing situations based on the determinations of the system, as stated in reference A, page 2, section 1.

22. As per claim 12, MAX teaches a system with a trap service order system that determines the dispatch is unnecessary (See reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 3-5, and reference C, page 3, section 1, which discuss screening/monitoring the generated service order and trapping the service order if the dispatch is unnecessary by looking at specific areas known to the system that

cause a dispatch to not be needed. For example, see reference A, page 1, sections 3 and 5). However, MAX does not expressly disclose that when the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined period of time, then the trap service order system communicates with the work management center to place the dispatch on hold.

Farris et al. teaches that when the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined period of time, then the trap service order system communicates with the work management center to place the dispatch on hold (See figures 14 and 17, column 20, lines 1-5 and 12-51, and column 29, lines 30-39, wherein the system determines whether the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined time. This time is arranged by the service representative within the work management center with the customer to occur within a predetermined time period. This dispatch is placed on hold until the determining if the dispatch is necessary occurs by the RTS system (trap system). If it is determined unnecessary by the RTS system (trap system) it is cancelled from the customer service request at the work control system. If it is determined necessary it is implemented and pushed forward by the work control system).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the dispatch of the technician of MAX on hold until a determination about the dispatch would be made in order to maximize the money saved and the service provided by using the system by not allowing a technician to be unnecessarily dispatched before a determination can be made. As stated in reference A, page 1, sections 1 and 4, the unnecessary dispatch of a technician has large financial and customer service ramifications.

23. As per claim 13, MAX teaches a system further comprising a loop facility assignment control system for receiving the service order, wherein if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch is unnecessary, then the trap service order system communicates with the loop facility assignment control system (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, and page 2, section 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1, which discusses a loop facility assignment control that receives a service order. The expert system determines if the dispatch is unnecessary and should not occur and communicates this information to the service order control system). However, MAX does not expressly disclose a database associated with the system that keeps track of the records or that the loop facility assignment control system specifically assigns facilities for the service order.

Farris et al. discloses a database associated with the system that keeps track of the records (See at least figure 13, column 13, lines 55-63, column 17, lines 30-33, column 18, lines 4-14 and 37-50, column 21, lines 10-18, and column 22, lines 12-20 and 40-52, which disclose databases keeping track of records associated with the computer system); and

the loop facility assignment control system assigning facilities for the service order (See at least column 4, lines 1-6, column 14, lines 2-10 and 56-67, column 15, lines 1-8, column 17, lines 5-22, column 18, lines 45-50, column 22, lines 12-35, column 33, lines 33-34, and column 34, lines 60-65, which discuss the loop facility assignment control system. It is responsible for assigning facilities for the received service order).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. Databases associated with computer systems are old and

well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a database to keep track of the records concerning the dispatches of technicians of MAX in order more efficiently and accurately keep records of the activities surrounding a service order.

Furthermore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the loop facility assignment control system of MAX assigning facilities for the service order in order to increase the efficiency of the system by streamlining and clustering the tasks into easy to follow and well defined modules that accomplish specific tasks.

24. As per claim 14, MAX discloses a system wherein if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch should be canceled, then the trap service order system communicates with the service order control system (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, and page 2, section 6, which discusses the assessment made by the expert system determining the dispatch is unnecessary and should not occur and communicating this information to the service order control system). However, MAX does not expressly disclose a database associated with the system that keeps track of the records.

Farris discloses a system with a database that keeps track of the records (See at least figure 13, column 13, lines 55-63, column 17, lines 30-33, column 18, lines 4-14 and 37-50, column 21, lines 10-18, and column 22, lines 12-20 and 40-52, which disclose databases keeping track of records associated with the computer system).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. Furthermore, databases associated with computer systems

are old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a database to keep track of the records concerning the dispatches of technicians of MAX in order more efficiently and accurately keep records of the activities surrounding a service order.

25. As per claim 15, MAX teaches a system wherein the service order control system generates a corrected service order, which cancels the dispatch in response to the update (See reference A, page 1, sections 3-5, and page 2, section 6, which discusses correcting the service order based on the assessment made by the expert system and the dispatch being found unnecessary and canceled based on this assessment). However, MAX does not expressly disclose a database associated with the system that keeps track of the records.

Farris discloses a system with a database that keeps track of the records (See at least figure 13, column 13, lines 55-63, column 17, lines 30-33, column 18, lines 4-14 and 37-50, column 21, lines 10-18, and column 22, lines 12-20 and 40-52, which disclose databases keeping track of records associated with the computer system).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. Furthermore, databases associated with computer systems are old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a database to keep track of the records concerning the dispatches of technicians of MAX in order more efficiently and accurately keep records of the activities surrounding a service order.

26. As per claim 19, MAX discloses a method wherein the set of predefined criteria include determining what is involved with the service order, such as facilities used in the service order (See reference A, page 1, sections 1, 3, and 5, reference B, page 2, section 1, and reference C, page 3, section 2, which discuss analyzing a service order presented to the system to determine what is involved with the service request, this information (such as facilities involved) indicating whether the service technician dispatch is really necessary). However, MAX does not expressly disclose determining if the service order is specifically a new install or a reinstall/reconnect.

Farris et al. discloses determining if the service order is specifically a new install or a reinstall/reconnect (See figures 14 and 17, column 12, lines 54-60, column 13, lines 38-62, column 14, lines 56-66, column 18, lines 15-22, column 19, lines 32-36 and 61-67, and column 20, lines 15-25, which disclose determining whether the service order involves a new install to the location or a reinstall/reconnect).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to access whether the service request of MAX was specifically a new install or a reinstall/reconnect when assessing if the dispatch of a service technician is necessary in order to more accurately determine the situations that require technician dispatch by considering all the pertinent information in the decision process, thus saving money by reducing the occurrence of unnecessary dispatches, as stated in reference A, page 1, sections 3 and 4.

27. As per claim 20, MAX teaches a method wherein correcting the service order comprises updating the service order in the service order control system (See reference A, page 1, sections

3-5, and page 2, section 6, which discusses the assessment made by the expert system determining the dispatch is unnecessary and should not occur and communicating this information to the service order control system). However, MAX does not expressly disclose a database associated with the system that keeps track of the records.

Farris discloses a system with a database that keeps track of the records (See at least figure 13, column 13, lines 55-63, column 17, lines 30-33, column 18, lines 4-14 and 37-50, column 21, lines 10-18, and column 22, lines 12-20 and 40-52, which disclose databases keeping track of records associated with the computer system).

Both Farris et al. and MAX teach methods that focus on reducing the likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician through the assessment of the service order presented and the facilities involved. Furthermore, databases associated with computer systems are old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a database to keep track of the records concerning the dispatches of technicians of MAX in order more efficiently and accurately keep records of the activities surrounding a service order.

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

29. No claims are allowed.

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"TCC: TCC's T-BERD 224 Helps Telcos Analyzer Caller ID" (Business Wire) teaches a technician remotely testing a circuit from a central office so as to eliminate an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician.

Babayev et al. (U.S. 5,615,121) teaches a tool for scheduling service providers to perform service calls received at the business center.

Sisley et al. (U.S. 5,737,728) teaches scheduling resources, such as technicians, in an optimal manner.

Bergeron et al. (U.S. 4,922,514) teaches an apparatus for controlling the dispatch of field technicians and engineers.

Panyko et al. ("Competing to Compete") discusses competitive local exchange carriers in the telecommunications industry and the need in the competitive market to optimize your resources, such as the dispatch of technicians in light of service requests.

"AUTODispatch" (Solomon IV) discloses a program for organizing and controlling the dispatches of service technicians to those situations that require a dispatch. The program stresses the importance of carefully allocating resources do that profits can be maximized.

Grenning ("New testing solutions give providers a competitive edge") discusses technicians having access to remote systems' data in order to promote reactive maintenance.

Flach ("Remote Test System Simplifies a Complex Maintenance and Repair Predicament") discusses remotely testing a service request to determine if it is necessary to dispatch a service technician.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bvd
November 18, 2002

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600